



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q68496

Toshio ANZAI

Appln. No.: 10/086,831

Group Art Unit: 2116

Confirmation No.: 2878

Examiner: Nitin C. PATEL

Filed: March 04, 2002

For: **POWER SYSTEM MANAGEMENT METHOD AND POWER SYSTEM
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing an Examiner initiated interview between Examiner Nitin C. Patel and Nataliya Dvorson, Esq.:

REMARKS

The interview was initiated by the Examiner. The Examiner contacted Applicant's Representative with a proposed Examiner's Amendment. Applicant's Representative authorized the proposed Examiner's Amendment on December 21, 2005. The Examiner's Amendment is attached to the Notice of Allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. Appln. No. 10/086,831
Attorney Docket No.: Q68496

maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Patent Office personnel is requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicant to date. The Interview Summary was attached to the Notice of Allowance dated January 11, 2006.

Accordingly, this Statement of Substance of the Interview is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application" and does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process."

The Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated January 11, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 31, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q68496



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q68496

Toshio ANZAI

Appln. No.: 10/086,831

Group Art Unit: 2116

Confirmation No.: 2878

Examiner: Nitin C. PATEL

Filed: March 04, 2002

For: **POWER SYSTEM MANAGEMENT METHOD AND POWER SYSTEM
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant makes the following comments on the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner's statement should not be misinterpreted as meaning that the identified feature is the only patentable feature in any of the claims. The independent claims and the dependent claims also include various other aspects which provide a separate basis for patentability. The Examiner's statement emphasizes certain aspects of the claims, but each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement.

The claims are carefully written to precisely define the bounds of the invention, and people reading these remarks hereafter should note that any difference between the Examiner's

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. Appln. No. 10/086,831
Attorney Docket No.: Q68496

language and the language of the claims should be resolved by recourse to only the express language of the claims.

Patent Office personnel is requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicant to date. As emphasized in the “Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) - Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed,” 1247OG111 (6/26/01), “a response to the examiner’s reasons for allowance” is an example of a paper that does “not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process” and is “not considered a ‘failure to engage in reasonable efforts’ to conclude processing or examination of the application.” Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated January 11, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 31, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q68496